UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,053	04/15/2004	Eric Martin	2003P08954 US01	9437

7590   01/07/2008

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
GREENE, JOSEPH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/826,053	MARTIN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	JOSEPH L. GREENE	4152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/15/2004, 05/21/2004, 03/21/2006*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.　　Claims 1—19 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2.　　Claims 4 and 8 are objected to for lack of an antecedent basis.

(a) Claim 4 contains the limitation "said browser window object."

(b) Claim 8 contains the limitation "said image."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.　　The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.　　**Claims 1, 5, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated**

by Joseph (Patent No. US 6,038,603).

5.　　With respect to claim 1, Joseph discloses a system employed by at least one

web browser compatible executable application for initiating an action by a second

executable application (column 3, lines 50-52; column 4, lines 62-63), comprising: a

URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a

predetermined particular format including context information and an action request

identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second

executable application (column 3, lines 53-63); a URL link interpreter, coupled to said

URL processor via a first mode of communication (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of

communication with respect to URL processing. Furthermore, the device that carries

out the Retrieve Operation Protocol Key step is a URL link interpreter), for identifying

said particular format URL link, for extracting said context information and action

request identifier from said particular format URL link, and for initiating termination of the

first mode of communication (column 3, lines 64-67); and a communication processor,

coupled to said URL link interpreter, for initiating communication of said extracted

context information (column 4, lines 1-9) and action request identifier to said second

executable application by a second mode of communication different from said first

mode of communication (fig. 10 describes the second mode of communication dealing

with the transferring of the data).

6.   As for claim 5, Joseph discloses wherein: said context information comprises

at least one of, (a) a user identifier, (b) a patient identifier, (c) a customer identifier, (d) a

source identifier, (e) a destination identifier, (f) a password, (g) a computer operational

session identifier, (h) an identifier identifying said second executable application to

perform said user command and (i) a data identifier; (column 4, lines 6-12, this section

shows limitations such as a destination identifier and source identifier and etc; column

5, lines 1-4, the machine port also acts as a source/destination identifier. Furthermore,

a path and file name field correspond to the application and also data) and said action

request identifier identifies at least one of, (i) a type of action to be performed by said

second application, (ii) a type of said user command, (iii) an event and (iv) an

authentication service (column 4, lines 6-12, the operation protocol clearly provides an

action request for the second application).

7.   With respect to claim 16, Joseph discloses a method employed by at least one

web browser compatible executable application for initiating an action by a second

executable application (column 3, lines 50-52; column 4, lines 62-63), comprising the

activities of: generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined

particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL

link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application

(column 3, lines 53-63); initiating communication to said URL link in a first mode of

communications (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of communication with respect to URL

processing); identifying said particular format link; extracting said context information

and action request identifier from said particular format link (column 3, lines 53-63);

initiating termination of said first mode of communication (fig. 9); and initiating

communication of said context information and action request identifier to said second

executable application by a second mode of communication different to said first mode

of communication (column 4, lines 1-9; fig. 10 displays the second mode of

communication).

8.   Claims 6-9, 13-14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Wang et al. (Patent No. US 7,200,683 B1) hereinafter Wang.

9.   With respect to claim 6, Wang discloses a system employed by at least one web

browser compatible executable application (column 8, lines 21-32) for receiving status

information (column 5, lines 64-67, where the server device's application is the second

executable application) associated with an action performed by a second executable

application (column 5, lines 21-24, the service control program in the application device

is the second executable application), comprising: an interface processor for: receiving

application data from said second executable application in response to a user

command entered via a displayed image (column 8, lines 55-57; column 8, line 67 to

column 9, line 5; and column 5, lines 64-67, the latter reference shows the connection

between the executable application software and the web based application); parsing

document object data (column 10, lines 37-41 describes selection for the HTML objects

which equates to the parsing) associated with said displayed image to find a

predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing

said received application data to be compatible with a web browser application (column

10, lines 32-36, this section shows the use of GUI style objects such as icons and text

boxes and etc. that are object based. Thus when they are pressed, their object data is

parsed in order for them to perform their actions; column 9, lines 21-25, the HTTP

protocol will allow the device to communicate with the web browser); and initiating

execution of said identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said

interface processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser

application (column 5, lines 64-67, i.e. receiving status info based on request).

10.   As for claim 7, Wang discloses wherein said application data comprises at

least one of, (a) a command identifier, (b) data and (c) status information associated

with an action performed by said second executable application (column 5, lines 64-67).

11.   As for claim 8, Wang discloses wherein: said image comprises a displayed

web page processed for display by said web browser application (column 10, lines 22-

25); and said document object data comprises a document object model associated

with said web page (column 9, lines 21-25, object data in the http format is associated

with web pages).

12.   As for claim 9, Wang discloses wherein said web page is represented by data

comprising at least one of, (a) HTML compatible data, (b) XML compatible data and (c)

SGML compatible data (column 9, lines 29-35; column 5, lines 33-41).

13.   As for claim 13, Wang discloses wherein said web browser application

initiates display of said received status information (abstract, lines 23-29).

14.   As for claim 14, Wang discloses wherein said received status information

includes at least one of, (a) an identifier identifying status of performance

of a task by said second executable application, (b) a status description and

(c) a text message (column 5, lines 64-67; column 6, lines 1-2, where the return of

status of saving a state is identifying status of performing a task).

15.   As for claim 17, Wang discloses a method employed by at least one web browser

compatible executable application (column 8, lines 21-32) for receiving status

information (column 5, lines 64-67, where the server device's application is the second

executable application) associated with an action performed by a second executable

application (column 5,lines 21-24, the service control program in the application device

is the second executable application), comprising the activities of: receiving application

data associated with an action performed by said second executable application in

response to a user command entered via a displayed browser image (column 8, lines

55-57; column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 5; and column 5, lines 64-67, the latter

reference shows the connection between the executable application software and the

web based application); parsing document object data associated with said browser

image to find a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure

for processing said received application data to be compatible with a web browser

application (column 10, lines 32-36, this section shows the use of GUI style objects

such as icons and text boxes and etc. that are object based. Thus when they are

pressed, their object data is parsed in order for them to perform their actions; column 9,

lines 21-25, the HTTP protocol will allow the device to communicate with the web

browser); and initiating execution of said identified executable procedure to provide

processed received application data to said web browser application (column 5, lines

64-67, i.e. receiving status info based on request).

16.   As for claim 18, Wang discloses updating a local storage location in response to

received application data (column II, lines 51-56, the device updates its icon on the GUI,

thus updating the storage where the image is located, Also, see abstract lines 11-15).

17.   As for claim 19, Wang discloses at least one of the activities of: requesting data;

performing a procedure; and responding to a command from a web enabled application

as a result of a change in status of said web browser compatible executable application

(abstract, lines 11-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Joseph as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barth et al. (Pre-Grant

Publication No. US 2001/0054020 A1) hereinafter Barth.

20.   As for claim 2, Joseph discloses wherein: said first mode of communication

comprises Hyper Text Transfer Protocol communication (column 5, lines 6-8), but

Joseph doesn't disclose Internet compatible communication and said second mode of

communication comprises at least one of, (i) Microsoft Windows compatible message

communication, (ii) socket communication, and (iii) COM communication. However,

Barth does teach Internet compatible communication ([0045], lines 1-3, Joseph uses

URLs and Barth teaches that URLs are internet compatible communication) and (i)

Microsoft Windows compatible message communication, (ii) socket communication, and

(iii) COM communication ([0162], lines 1-5; with socket communication being the

standard method of communication to access a processor).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Joseph in order to utilize the aforementioned

standard forms of communication, as taught by Barth, to avoid the costs and design

time of creating new forms of communication. Furthermore, by applicant's own

admission, these forms of communication are standard (see Martin et al, {0039], lines

9-13).

21.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jasen et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2002/0019879 A1) hereinafter Jasen.

22.   As for claim 3, Joseph doesn't disclose wherein said second executable application is a non-web enabled application. However, Jasen does teach such a system between a network manager and a non-web enabled application ([0018], lines 1-16). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Joseph in order to utilize the aforementioned limitation, as taught by Jasen, in order to successfully expand the scope and accessibility of products designed to work over networks. In addition, this sort of communication between web enabled and non-web enabled application has been utilized in many systems (including online video gaming) for some time.

23.   Claims 10, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph in view of Wang.

24,   As for claim 10, Joseph teaches a communication processor (column 4, lines 1-9), but doesn't teach an interface processor, for communicating with said second executable application to acquire said application data. However, Wang does teach such a system (column 3, lines 50-52; column 4, lines 62-63). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

teachings of Joseph in order to have a second executable application talk with a

communication processor. Doing so will accurately allow to devices to communicate

with each other.

25.   As for claim 12, Joseph teaches a communication processor and a request from

said communication processor (column 4, lines 1-9). But Joseph Doesn't teach

establishing non-polling communication with said second executable application

and said second executable application provides said status information in response to

at least one of, (i) a command by said second executable application and (ii) a request

from said communication processor.

        However, Wang does teach establishing non-polling communication with said

second executable application and said second executable application provides said

status information (column 5, lines 64-67) and in response to at least one of, (i) a

command by said second executable application and (column 5, lines 21-24, this

section explains the operation of the second application). It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of

Joseph in order to have a second executable application talk with a communication

processor. Doing so will accurately allow to devices to communicate with each other.

26.   As for claim 15 Joseph Discloses a system employed by at least one web

browser compatible executable application for initiating an action by a second

executable application (column 3, lines 50-52; column 4, lines 62-63), comprising: a

URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application (column 3, lines 53-63); a URL link interpreter, coupled to said URL processor via a first mode of communication (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of communication with respect to URL processing), for identifying said particular format URL link, for extracting said context information and action request identifier from said particular format URL link, and for initiating termination of the first mode of communication (column 3, lines 64-67); and a communication processor, coupled to said URL link interpreter, for initiating communication of said extracted context information (column 4, lines 1-9) and action request identifier to said second executable application by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication (fig. 10 describes the second mode of communication dealing with the transferring of the data).

However, Joseph doesn't teach acquiring status information or a system employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application for receiving status information associated with an action performed by a second executable application, comprising: an interface processor for: receiving application data from said second executable application in response to a user command entered via a displayed image; parsing document object data associated with said displayed image to find a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing said received application data to be compatible with a web browser

application; and initiating execution of said identified executable procedure,

in response to a command from said interface processor, to provide processed

received application data to said web browser application.

On the other hand, Wang does disclose acquiring status information (column 5,

lines 64-67) and Wang also discloses a system employed by at least one web browser

compatible executable application (column 8, lines 21-32) for receiving status

information (column 5, lines 64-67, where the server device's application is the second

executable application) associated with an action performed by a second executable

application (column 5, lines 21-24, the service control program in the application device

is the second executable application), comprising: an interface processor for: receiving

application data from said second executable application in response to a user

command entered via a displayed image (column 8, lines 55-57; column 8, line 67 to

column 9, line 5; and column 5, lines 64-67, the latter reference shows the connection

between the executable application software and the web based application); parsing

document object data associated with said displayed image to find a predetermined

procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing said received

application data to be compatible with a web browser application (column 10, lines 32-

36, this section shows the use of GUI style objects such as icons and text boxes and

etc. that are object based. Thus when they are pressed, their object data is parsed in

order for them to perform their actions; column 9, lines 21-25, the HTTP protocol will

allow the device to communicate with the web browser); and initiating execution of said

identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said interface

processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser

application (column 5, lines 64-67, i.e. receiving status info based on request).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teaching of Joseph in order to allow the secondary system to

communicate back through the use of a web browser compatible application, as taught

by Wang. The entire system provides diversity in internet control over applications. It is

an efficient system that helped move technology closer to the modern standards of most

things on a computer system having the ability to be remotely controlled.

27.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Joseph, in view of Wang as applied to claim 10 above, and in further view of

Barth.

28.   As for claim 11, Joseph teaches a communication processor (column 4, lines

1-9), but doesn't teach communicating with said second executable application.

However, Wang does teach such a system (column 5, lines 64-67, where the program

of the device is the application). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Joseph in order to

communicate with non-web based applications. Doing so provides a broader range of

applications for the system taught by Joseph.

In addition, the teachings of Joseph and Wang disclose a communication

processor communicating with a secondary executable application. But Joseph and

Wang don't teach using (i) Microsoft Windows compatible message communication, (ii)

socket communication, and (iii) COM communication. However, Barth teaches the use

of such communication methods ([0162], lines 1-5; with socket communication being the

standard method of communication to access a processor). It would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings

of Joseph and Wang in order to utilize the aforementioned standard forms of

communication, as taught by Barth, to avoid the costs and design time of creating new

forms of communication. Furthermore, by applicant's own admission, these forms of

communication are standard (see Martin et al, {0039], lines 9-13).

29.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Joseph as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Wang, and in further view of *The*

***Complete Reference: Internet Millennium edition,* copyright 1999, hereinafter IME.**

30.   As for claim 4, Joseph teaches a URL processor and setting the URL to a

particular format (column 3, lines 53-63) but doesn't teach wherein: said user command

is received via a displayed web page; and setting a location property of said browser

window object to an address of said particular format. However, Wang teaches using a

displayed web page (column 10, lines 22-25). It would have been obvious to modify the

teachings of Joseph with the web page of Wang. Doing so would allow Joseph's

system to communicate via the standard method of internet communication.

Joseph in view of Wang teaches wherein: said user command is received via a

displayed web page; and said URL processor sets a location property, but Joseph in view of Wang doesn't teach setting browser window object to an address. However, IME does teach such a system (page 464: the address bar: listed in this section he discusses how a URL is placed in the address bar. The address bar object, then manipulates the URL to set a location). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Joseph in view of Wang with the address bar concept of IME. Doing so would be an implementation of the standard form of communication of a web browser that is used by such common applications such as Microsoft Internet Explorer, Netscape, and Mozilla Firefox).

Conclusion

31.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH L. GREENE whose telephone number is (571)270-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on (571) 272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLG

/Nabil El-Hady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152